Interview Summary

Application No. 09/004,544

Applicant(s)

Tu et al

2613

Exam

Examiner

Richard Lee Art Unit

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) Richard Lee	(3)
(2) Marc S. Hanish	(4)
Date of Interview Oct 15, 2002	
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🔀 No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed:	
Claim(s) discussed: Identification of prior art discussed:	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) \square was not reached. h) \square N/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:	
Mr. Hanish informed the Examiner that this case has been abandoned.	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	
i) 🔀 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).	
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached	
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's signature, if required